## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated August 26, 2005, the examiner subjected claims 1-95 to a restriction requirement. The following claim groups are identified:

I	An Individual Sensor Pod	Claims 1-19
II	An Array of Sensor Pods	Claims 20-74
III	A Method of Conducting Surveys	Claims 75-94
IV	A Method of Transferring Data	Claim 95

In response to the restriction requirement, applicant provisionally elects Group II claims (claims 20-74) for prosecution. According, Group I claims (claims 1-19) and Group IV claims (claim 95) are cancelled without prejudice.

The inventions of Group II and Group III are related as an apparatus and a method for its practice, respectively. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process.

M.P.E.P. § 806.95(e). The examiner has asserted that the method of Group III claims is limited only to conducting downhole surveys but that the apparatus of Group II claims could be used in land surveys where the sensors are strung out across a survey area instead of being placed in bore holes.

Group III independent method claim 75 is amended so that it is no longer limited to conducting downhole surveys. This amendment is fully supported by the specification. Thus, Group II and III claims no longer cover distinct inventions, because the method for conducting surveys claimed in Group III cannot be practiced by another materially different apparatus and the sensor array claimed in Group II cannot be used to practice a materially different method. Claim 76, which depends on claim 75, is amended to add the limitation of the sensor array being place in a borehole. Claims 90, 92, and 93 are amended to be

consistent with the changes to claims 75 and 76 for antecedent basis purposes. In view of these amendments, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's assertion that Group II and Group III claims cover distinct inventions. Applicant hereby traverses the examiner's restriction requirement as to Groups II and III.

In summary, claims 20-94 are pending in the application. Applicant believes the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 20-94 in light of the amendments herein and passage to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrews & Kurth L.L.P. 600 Travis, Suite 4200 Houston, Texas 77002 713/220-3813 (office) 713/238-4285 (facsimile) Customer No. 23,444

Date: Sept. 16, 2005

Brett T. Cooke Reg. No. 55,836